



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,911	09/22/2003	Elliot N. Linzer	03-1089 1496.00325	9918
24319	7590	10/16/2007	EXAMINER	
LSI CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA 95035			DESIR, JEAN WICEL	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2622		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,911	LINZER, ELLIOT N.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jean W. Désir	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/30/07 (Amendment).
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demos (US 5,988,863) in view of Soundararajan (US 7,039,113).

Claim 1:

Demos clearly disclosed:

An apparatus (see *Fig. 10*) comprising:

"a decoder circuit configured to receive an encoded video signal at a first input and to present a decoded video signal at a first output", see *item 100 of Fig. 10 which constitutes a decoder circuit as claimed*;

"and a scaler circuit (*items 102, 104, 106 of Fig. 10 constitute a scaler circuit*) configured to receive said decoded video signal at a second input and to present (i) a first video output signal (*output: 1k x 512 pixels resolution at 72 Hz, or output: 2k x 1k pixels resolution at 24 or 36 Hz*) having a first resolution at a second output and (ii) a second video output signal (*output: 2k x 1k pixels resolution at 72 Hz*) having a second resolution at a third output, wherein said first video output signal and said second video

output signal are generated in response to said decoded video signal (*item 100 of Fig. 10*);

the only difference between the claimed invention and Demos' disclosure is that Demos does not explicitly show a user input signal as claimed in claim 1. However, in the same field of endeavor, the reference to Soundararajan discloses a user input signal (see the system of Fig. 1 item 170) that allows the user to optimize the system based on the user's preference and/or on the user's system's capabilities; an artisan would be motivated to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention, this combination would advantageously produce an optimized system based on the user's preference and/or on the user's system's capabilities. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 2 is disclosed, see Demos at item 100, col. 9 lines 26-27.

Claim 3 is disclosed, see Demos at col. 11 lines 32-37, col. 14 lines 32-35, Soundararajan at col. 2 lines 53-54, col. 1 lines 51-54.

Claim 4 is disclosed, see Demos at item 102 or 104 which constitutes a first video generating circuit as claimed, and items 104, 106 which constitute a second video generating circuit as claimed.

Claim 5 is disclosed, see Demos at items 102, 104, 106, Soundararajan at col. 2 lines 53-54, col. 1 lines 51-54.

Claims 6-8 are disclosed, see Demos at col. 19 lines 28-39, col. 14 lines 32-39.

Claims 9, 10 are disclosed, see Demos at col. 19 lines 40-49, col. 14 lines 28-39.

Claim 11 is disclosed, see Demos at col. 14 lines 35-39, col. 1 line 53.

Claim 12 is disclosed, see Demos at col. 15 lines 15-36.

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 15 is disclosed, see Demos at item 100, col. 9 lines 26-27.

Claim 16:

The above combination of Demos and Soundararajan references generates first and second intermediate signals as claimed and as already pointed out in the rejection of claim 3 (see Demos col. 11 lines 32-37, col. 14 lines 32-35, Soundararajan at col. 2 lines 53-54, col. 1 lines 51-54), except the combination does not explicitly teach these signals are generated simultaneously; however, providing signals simultaneously is a notoriously well known technique in the art used in order to make them available concurrently for further processing and/or to make them available to users concurrently; thus an artisan would be motivated to modify the above combination and implement this existing technique in order to arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 17 is disclosed, see Demos at col. 15 lines 15-36.

Claims 18, 19 are disclosed, see Demos at col. 11 lines 32-37, col. 14 lines 32-35.

Claims 20-22 are disclosed, see Demos at col. 19 lines 28-39, col. 14 lines 32-39.

Claims 23, 24 are disclosed, see Demos at col. 19 lines 40-49, col. 14 lines 28-39.

Claim 25 is disclosed in view of the above combination, see Demos at col. 14 lines 35-39, col. 1 line 53, and signals that are presented simultaneously is already addressed in the rejection of claim 16.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection necessitated by the amendment.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean W. Désir whose telephone number is (571) 272 7344. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 - First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272 7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWD
Oct. 14, 07



DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER